

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, October 6, 2005
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman
*Avondale: Michael Powell
Buckeye: Cathy Charney for Carroll Reynolds
#Chandler: Jim Weiss
*El Mirage: Lucky Roberts
Gilbert: Greg Svelund for Tami Ryall
Glendale: Doug Kukino
Mesa: Scott Bouchie
Phoenix: Joe Gibbs for Gaye Knight
Scottsdale: Larry Person
*Surprise: Jim Nichols
Tempe: Oddvar Tveit
*Citizen Representative: Walter Bouchard
*American Lung Association of Arizona: Bill Pfeifer
Salt River Project: Sunil Varma
Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell
*Arizona Public Service Company: Jim Mikula
*Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey
Valley Metro: Betsy Turner for Randi Alcott
*Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry
*Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish
*Arizona Rock Products Association: Rusty Bowers
*Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Michelle Rill

*Associated General Contractors: Amanda McGennis
*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona:
Connie Wilhelm-Garcia
*American Institute of Architects - Central Arizona:
Stephen J. Andros
*Valley Forward: Peter Allard
*University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension:
Patrick Clay
Arizona Department of Transportation: Beverly Chenausky
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Peter Hyde
*Environmental Protection Agency: Wienke Tax
Maricopa County Air Quality Department:
Jo Crumbaker
*Arizona Department of Weights and Measures:
Duane Yantorno
Federal Highway Administration: Ed Stillings
Arizona State University: Hank Dabibi for Judi Nelson
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:
Allison Bree Desmond for B. Bobby Ramirez

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Participated via telephone conference call.
+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Ranjith Dandanayakula, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Ann Wimmer, Maricopa Association of Governments

Eric Anderson, Maricopa Association of Governments
Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental
Quality
Kathleen Sommer, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Jermaine Hannon, Federal Highway Administration
Cathy Chaberski, City of Glendale
Tami Stowe, House of Representatives

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on October 6, 2005. Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman, began discussion of the agenda items at approximately 1:40 p.m. since a quorum was not present. Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Cleveland stated that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the table adjacent to the doorway inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items and nonaction agenda items. Mr. Cleveland noted that no public comment cards had been received.

7. Update on Critical Issues with the Maricopa County Air Programs

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an update on the critical issues with the Maricopa County Air Quality Department Programs. She indicated that she would provide an overview and then a detailed update on the two critical air quality issues. Ms. Bauer noted the accomplishments of the Maricopa County Air Quality Department since its creation November 17, 2004. A summary of the accomplishments was provided to the Committee.

Ms. Bauer then addressed critical issue #1, the EPA Notice of Deficiency for the Maricopa County Title V Air Permit Program for Industry. She stated that by the August 18, 2005 deadline, the County submitted a formal response to EPA on its corrective action to fix all deficiencies. She mentioned that EPA reported that significant progress has been made and the threat of sanctions, including the loss of federal highway funds, is no longer looming. It appears that this issue may now be set aside.

Ms. Bauer addressed critical issue #2, the enforcement of the Maricopa County Dust Control Rules. She stated that in June 2004, EPA requested that Maricopa County hire 25-30 dust inspectors to enforce the Fugitive Dust Control Rules. Ms. Bauer advised that failure to enforce dust rules could jeopardize attainment and lead to a requirement for a five percent reduction in emissions per year.

Ms. Bauer noted that this is a critical time period for PM-10. She stated that the region needs clean data for 2004, 2005, and 2006 to attain the PM-10 standards. A five percent plan would be due December 31, 2007 if the PM-10 standards are not met. Ms. Bauer mentioned that in 2004, one monitor exceeded the 24-hour standard and two exceeded the annual standard. In 2005, two monitors have exceeded the 24-hour standard; however, these are under investigation to see if they are due to natural or exceptional events. Ms. Bauer explained that there is still a chance that the region could attain the PM-10 standards since the numbers are averaged, but the numbers still need to come down at the monitors.

Ms. Bauer discussed the dust control efforts being made by the Air Quality Department. She indicated that the County has converted temporary positions to permanent, advertised for vacant

positions, compiled a list of qualified candidates, cross-trained other positions to conduct dust control inspections, conducted training courses for the regulated community, and entered into enforcement settlements. Ms. Bauer mentioned that out of 40 total positions, 30 have been filled. The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors authorized the funding for the additional ten inspectors on September 30, 2005. The County will soon be posting these positions and begin the hiring process. Ms. Bauer added that the County is also conducting a market study on the salaries for the entire Air Quality Department, including the Dust Control Program. The study will be completed by November 30, 2005.

4. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for FY 2011 for the FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP

Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments, presented the evaluation of proposed Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) projects submitted for fiscal year 2011 for the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Giles indicated that the projects were due to MAG by September 2, 2005. He added that the evaluation was a major undertaking and that the schedule is typically driven by the Transportation Programming Process. The materials were mailed out with the agenda six days in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Giles stated that the evaluation is one piece of the information that may be used by the modal committees for prioritizing projects. He emphasized that there is still opportunity to comment on the evaluation. Mr. Giles distributed a tentative schedule for the proposed FY 2006 PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers Projects, FY 2007 Paving Unpaved Road Projects, and FY 2011 CMAQ Projects. In addition, he noted that interagency consultation was being conducted on the estimated emission reductions, as well as the CMAQ Methodologies, and comments are requested by October 18, 2005.

Mr. Giles indicated that the results of the project evaluation were provided to the Committee in order of cost-effectiveness by modal category based on the plan allocations provided in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). At the request of the Committee, the project evaluation was also provided using nonweighted emission reductions. He stated that the Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects, August 15, 2005, were used to estimate the emission reduction benefits of the proposed CMAQ projects.

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, said that Wienke Tax, Environmental Protection Agency, was unable to attend the meeting so she had e-mailed her comments to MAG. Since the comments were received that morning, there had not been time to respond in writing. Ms. Arthur indicated that she would respond verbally to Ms. Tax's questions, copies of which were provided at each person's place.

CMAQ Projects for the FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP

(1) "Are there FTA or other funds available for the light rail project? I notice the request from Valley Metro is for over \$18M from a total CMAQ pot of \$20M."

Ms. Arthur responded that the Regional Transportation Plan estimates that \$20M in CMAQ will apply to air quality, bicycle, pedestrian and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects. In addition, there are other sources of funds for light rail such as local taxes and other federal funding.

She indicated that the RTP estimates that an additional \$18M in CMAQ will be available for light rail transit in FY 2011.

Ms. Arthur explained that the five tables provided in the packet represent five modal allocations of CMAQ funds contained in the RTP (i.e., air quality, bike/pedestrian, light rail, ITS, HOV lanes). Ms. Arthur indicated that the exact magnitude of total CMAQ funds available is unknown at this time because new federal transportation legislation (SAFETEA-LU) was signed on August 10, 2005.

(2) “I find the cost effectiveness of many of the bicycle and pedestrian projects, the ITS projects, and the HOV lane project distressing (especially when they are over \$100,000/metric ton of pollution reduced). It seems to me these projects ought to be funded out of monies that do not involve CMAQ criteria, unless perhaps their Congestion Mitigation (CMS) scores are particularly high.”

Ms. Arthur responded that it is tempting to draw a “bright-line” of \$10,000 or \$100,000 per metric ton, but it is important to keep in mind that the cost effectiveness scores have risen by 100-200% based on the latest CMAQ methodologies. For example, ITS projects have no PM-10 benefit and if you remove the priority and seasonal weights on volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides, the cost effectiveness will be one-quarter of the values shown in the tables. It is important to look at the relative cost effectiveness within each RTP modal allocation.

(3) “What do the CMS scores indicate? What does MAG or do the modal committees consider a good CMS score?”

Ms. Arthur responded that the CMS score is primarily based on average daily traffic volumes and volume to capacity ratios in the present and future. She said that the CMS scores are normalized to a scale of 1-100 and two-thirds of the scores are between 50 and 60. A good score would be one over 60.

Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Roads Projects (2007 CMAQ)

(4) “I don’t understand the large cost discrepancy between the three projects. Cave Creek can pave 10 miles of unpaved roads for \$500,000 (\$250,000 worth of CMAQ funds) while Chandler estimates it will cost \$650,000 (\$325,000 of CMAQ funds) to pave 0.5 miles of unpaved roads?”

Ms. Arthur responded that street paving involves differing engineering requirements and materials that create a large range in road-paving cost estimates. For example, double chip seal material is far less expensive than concrete. She indicated that the unpaved road segment in Chandler is also located in an urbanized area which could create additional costs for pre-engineering, moving utilities, etc. She said the MAG rule-of-thumb for road paving projects is \$500,000 per mile. It is important to keep in mind that these are federally-funded projects and therefore, must meet federal road paving standards.

Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for 2006 CMAQ Funding

(5) “The street sweeping projects are particularly cost-effective. I would like to see as many of these funded as possible. I hope the purchases would occur early in calendar 2006 so that the Phoenix area could benefit from this control measure for most of calendar 2006.”

Ms. Arthur responded that the \$960,000 in CMAQ funding for PM-10 certified street sweepers in the FY 2006 TIP will fund 5 sweepers. These sweepers may be purchased anytime after Regional Council approval on October 26, 2005. Although there is no guarantee that year-end funds will be available in mid-2006, in past years all remaining unfunded sweeper requests have been funded with year-end close-out funds.

(6) “How do you treat late submittals?”

Ms. Arthur indicated that two street sweeper requests submitted by ADOT after the deadline (in this case, September 15, 2005) are asterisked and footnoted in the List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for CMAQ Funding. We do not assign a late penalty in the formula. Asterisking and footnoting the projects in the table highlights the projects that were not submitted on time.

General Comment

(7) “As a final note, it would have been nice to have had more time to review the detailed information you sent out. My package was postmarked Friday September 30, so I didn’t get to start reviewing the information until Monday morning.”

Ms. Arthur explained that MAG staff had made a concerted effort to mail the materials by Thursday September 29. However, the large number and multiple types of projects made it difficult to meet this deadline. She explained that the transportation model run for the HOV lane project did not complete computer processing until Thursday morning.

Ms. Arthur also noted that this was not the last opportunity to make comments on the CMAQ methodologies, the CMAQ scores, and the ranking of projects. The consultation process will continue until October 18, 2005. In addition, there will be a large number of MAG meetings between now and December to discuss the CMAQ projects and your input is welcomed at any of those meetings. Mr. Cleveland stated that action on agenda item four would be held until a quorum is present.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2007 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for emission reductions and corresponding cost-effectiveness for FY 2007 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funding. He stated that the deadline for submitting projects was September 15, 2005 and three projects requesting \$8.1 million in federal funds were received. Beginning in FY 2007, the FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program identifies \$1.35 million in CMAQ funding for Paving Unpaved Road Projects.

Mr. Giles stated that the proposed projects were evaluated using the Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects, August 15, 2005. He added that there are still several opportunities to comment on the evaluation. Mr. Giles indicated that the projects were provided to the Committee in order of cost-effectiveness. Mr. Cleveland asked if this agenda item relates to use of FY 2007 funds whereas agenda item four is adding projects to FY 2011. Mr. Giles responded that is correct.

Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, commented on the disconnect between the \$1.35 million in CMAQ funding available and the \$8.1 million requested. Mr. Giles replied that if the projects are forwarded, it is possible that additional funding may become available during the year-end closeout process.

Mr. Cleveland inquired about funding the Cave Creek and Chandler projects for the amounts requested and allocate the balance to the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project and give it first priority on any funds that may become available during the closeout process. Mr. Giles responded that it is not known how much funding would be available through the FY 2006 closeout process for PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects. Ms. Arthur added that the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project could also be funded incrementally.

Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration, commented that a previous Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project was deferred because questions were raised on how to proceed since the Arizona Department of Transportation cannot contract with the Nation. Therefore, this current project may not be feasible. Mr. Weiss asked to raise the priority of the Chandler project due to the uncertainty with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project. Mr. Cleveland stated that action on agenda item five would be held until a quorum is present.

6. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2006 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of the proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2006 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funding. The FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program and FY 2006-2010 MAG TIP contain \$960,000 in FY 2006 CMAQ funding for the purchase of PM-10 certified street sweepers. Mr. Giles stated that project requests were due by September 15, 2005 and fifteen projects requesting approximately \$2.48 million in federal funds were received. He added that a minimum local match of 5.7 percent is required. Mr. Giles indicated that the projects were evaluated using the Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects, August 15, 2005 and provided to the Committee ranked in order of cost-effectiveness.

Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, asked if the shaded projects are those close to PM-10 monitors. Mr. Giles responded that is correct. Mr. Person, inquired about why the Phoenix #1 sweeper project ranked so high when the sweeper would be replacing an older certified street sweeper as opposed to a conventional, noncertified street sweeper. Ms. Arthur replied that the certified street sweeper model that is being replaced is less efficient than the new model. She discussed the number of days it takes for the road to return to equilibrium after being swept with a certified street sweeper (eight days) versus a less efficient certified sweeper (four days).

Mr. Person asked why replacement sweepers are being ranked above expansion sweepers. Ms. Arthur responded that based on the methodologies, a replacement sweeper typically reduces more emissions than an expansion sweeper.

Mr. Cleveland inquired about the variance in the overall cost of the street sweepers. Ms. Arthur replied that MAG has a list of sweeper features that are not eligible for CMAQ funding, because they do not contribute to PM-10 reductions. She added that if a project request is received that includes

items that are not eligible, the jurisdiction is notified of the equipment and amount of the request eligible for CMAQ funding. However, there is still a wide variance in the overall cost of street sweepers. Ms. Arthur discussed the costs of specific street sweeper models and what makes some more expensive than others.

Oddvar Tveit, City of Tempe, stated that the table provided to the Committee that lists the street sweeper projects indicates whether the jurisdictions have committed resources for their projects. He commented that all information included in the table should be relevant to the action of the Committee. Mr. Cleveland added that the question on the project request form that relates to the commitment of local resources for additional staff may need to be reworded for clarification purposes. For replacement sweeper projects, it is not clear whether additional staff resources are being committed above the existing staff base.

Mr. Cleveland inquired about how sweepers projects that were submitted after the deadline have been handled in the past. Mr. Giles replied that projects submitted after the deadline are denoted in the table. Mr. Cleveland asked for discussion on the rank order of the street sweeper projects. Mr. Person requested that there be a column in the table that indicates if a street sweeper is replacing an older, less efficient, certified street sweeper rather than put this information in a footnote. He expressed concern about funding PM-10 certified street sweepers to replace older models instead of funding sweepers that replace conventional street sweepers.

Mr. Person commented that, in a way to reuse the technology, the City of Phoenix could send their older PM-10 certified street sweeper to a jurisdiction that does not have one. Joe Gibbs, City of Phoenix, stated that discussions should start on the option of sending older certified sweepers to jurisdictions that need one. Scott Bouchie, City of Mesa, commented on the maintenance schedules of older street sweepers. He also stated that some jurisdictions are getting to the point where they need new PM-10 certified street sweepers in order to keep the sweeper schedules where they are now.

Mr. Hyde inquired about the daily emission reductions of the street sweeper projects. Ms. Arthur responded that the daily emission reductions vary due to three factors: number of lane miles swept, number of days between sweeping cycles, and average daily traffic. Mr. Hyde asked if MAG discusses with the jurisdictions where their projects will rank. Ms. Arthur replied that MAG will contact the jurisdiction to get clarification if the information provided on the application does not look reasonable.

Mr. Cleveland indicated that a quorum was now present and called the meeting to order. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, moved to recommend the list of PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects in rank order for FY 2006 CMAQ funding. Mr. Person seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cleveland asked for a motion to retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2006 CMAQ funds that may become available due to year-end closeout, including any redistributed obligation authority, or additional funding received by this region. Mr. Tveit moved and Mr. Kukino seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Person commented that with the \$960,000 available, five street sweeper projects could be funded, with approximately \$115,000 remaining. He made a motion to move up the Surprise #1 sweeper project in the prioritized list to receive available funding since this sweeper will be reducing PM-10 emissions near a PM-10 monitor. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hyde.

Mr. Gibbs commented that the City of Surprise should be notified that the Surprise #1 street sweeper project may be funded for the full amount requested during the year-end closeout process. Mr. Cleveland stated that the City of Surprise would have the option to wait and see if the project would be funded through closeout or proceed with the funds available at this time.

Mr. Kukino made a motion to recommend the PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2006 CMAQ funding in the following order: Gilbert #1, Gilbert #2, Gilbert #3, Phoenix #1, Arizona Department of Transportation #1, and Surprise #1 to the extent funding is available. Mr. Person seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for FY 2011 for the FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP (Continued)

Mr. Cleveland asked for a motion to forward the Air Quality Projects in rank order to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC). Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, moved and Mr. Gibbs seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cleveland asked for a motion to forward the evaluation of proposed CMAQ projects for FY 2011 for the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to the MAG TRC and modal committees for use in prioritizing projects. Mr. Bouchie moved and Mr. Gibbs seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the September 1, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the September 1, 2005 meeting. Mr. Bouchie moved and Mr. O'Donnell seconded, and the motion to approve the September 1, 2005 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2007 CMAQ Funding (Continued)

Mr. Weiss made a motion to recommend the Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2007 CMAQ funding to be forwarded to the MAG TRC in the following order: Cave Creek, Chandler, and Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. Mr. Person seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the procedures with regards to attendance of Committee members. He suggested looking at past attendance and having the option of nonvoting members in an effort to have a quorum for those who want to attend the meetings. Ms. Bauer indicated that MAG staff will take a look at past attendance and contact those entities who have not been attending regularly to determine if they still want to be on the Committee. Mr. Cleveland thanked Mr. O'Donnell for his comments and emphasized the importance of a quorum.

8. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Cleveland announced that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, November 3, 2005. Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, mentioned the Transportation Conformity State Implementation Plan as a possible future agenda item.

Mr. Cleveland inquired about the policy for mailing out agendas prior to the meetings. Ms. Bauer replied that the MAG policy is to mail out agendas one week in advance of the meeting. However, MAG will mail out agendas earlier if possible.

Mr. Hyde commented on the five categories of CMAQ projects submitted for FY 2011 for the FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP. He inquired about how the plan allocations for each category are determined. He suggested this topic for a future agenda item. Ms. Bauer responded that the plan allocations are from the adopted Regional Transportation Plan. She added that the MAG Transportation Policy Committee polled the citizens, who wanted a multi-modal plan. Mr. Cleveland suggested that MAG staff discuss the plan allocations for future years at the next meeting.

Ms. Arthur asked the Committee if Attachment B for agenda item four, which provides the nonweighted emission reductions for the proposed CMAQ projects for FY 2011 ranked by cost-effectiveness by modal category, was beneficial in reviewing the project evaluation. The Committee indicated that it was not particularly useful and that it is not necessary to develop Attachment B in the future. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned.